(ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಚಿಕ್ಕಲಿಂಗಯ್ಯ.)

ನಮಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡಲು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗದಿದ್ದರೆ, ಖಾನಗಿ ನಿರ್ಣಯಗಳಿವೆ ; ಈ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳು ಮುಗಿದು ಹೋದಮೇಲೆ ಆ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ನಿರ್ಣಯಗಳನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆಯೇ ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—We have to strictly adhere to the rules. We cannot by-pass them. There is no provision for such a thing.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—Can I make a statement regarding the procedure we have adopted ?

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT.

Re. Message Rate System for Telephones.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Before we go to that, let us take up the matter regarding the adjournment motion. Sri Siddaveerappa, have you got to say anything regarding the adjournment motion ?

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA (Minister for Home and Industries).—Sir, yesterday, you were pleased to ask me whether it would be possible to take up a special resolution in this behalf. Sir, it is well-known to the Hon'ble Member who has tabled this adjournment motion that, in the Seventh Schedule under item No. 31, List I, 'Telephones' is a Central subject. Further, even in the case of a special resolution, under Rule 102, sub-clause (*c*), it is clearly laid down that it shall not relate to a matter which is not the concern of this Government. These two points are there. Further, as you are all aware, telephones were given over to the Centre under the system of Financial Integration that was entered into in the year 1950 or 1951. Now the point is this. What the Hon'ble Member wants to drive home, namely, that so much of inconvenience is felt by the public of Bangalore, I am prepared to convey to the Central Government or the concerned Ministry in the Central Government requesting them to reconsider the question. If this satisfies the Hon'ble Member, I do not think there is any need for a resolution. My only anxiety in this matter is this. The Central Government are not here to defend themselves for the action they have taken, if any, remarks or if any criticism is levelled. I do not think this House is competent to criticise the action of an authority unless that authority is capable of defending itself on the floor of the House. It is an elementary principle too well known. This is my humble suggestion, Sir. What the Hon'ble Mover of the Adjournment Motion desires the Government to know, I have already noted. I am prepared to send or convey the views of this House to the Central Government for reconsidering. I would urge that point before them. If you also feel that some kind of resolution is necessary, I have brought this to your consideration, and I will bow to your decision.

*Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM (Jagalur).—I thank the Government for their statement that they are going to take up this matter with the Central Government. Apart from it, in order to strengthen their hands and to make a more effective approach, it is better that they are armed with a resolution of this House. Then, it will not only be the opinion of the Government but it will also be the opinion of the public through their representatives in this House.

As I pointed out yesterday, it may not be a matter for an adjournment motion. I submit it may be taken up as a special resolution as it affects the entire State and all classes of persons. It is true that it is a Central subject. It is true that the Telephones have been ceded to the Centre. They are governed by the terms of integration. It is also necessary for us to examine those terms of integration . . . .

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—That is exactly why I wanted to say that the resolution is not necessary. What is the good of your thinking about the terms of integration which is a *fait accompli* ?

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—Since it is a matter of urgent public importance, and since we want to represent our grievances more effectively, since the action of the Central Government is *ex parte* as they have done it without consulting the subjects of this State who are also citizens of India, it is

better we make our representation and put forth our grievances to the Centre through the Government from this House. Government will be in a better position to put forward our grievances and the feelings of the public.

ಶ್ರೀ ವಿ. ವೆಂಕಟಪ್ಪ (ಚನ್ನಪಟ್ಟಣ).—ಫೋರ್ಸ್ ಗಳನ್ನು ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸಬಹುದೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ದುಡ್ಡುಕೊಟ್ಟು ಫೋರ್ಸ್ ಮಾಡಬಹುದೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಅಲ್ಲಿಟ್ಟಿರುವ ಒಂದು ಪುಸ್ತಕದಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾರು ಯಾರಿಗೆ ಫೋರ್ಸ್ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಎಂದು ಬೇರೆ ಒಂದು ಕಾಲಂ ಆದರಲ್ಲಿದೆ, ಇದೇಕೆ? ದುಡ್ಡು ಕೊಟ್ಟವರೆಲ್ಲ ಯಾರಾದರೂ ಫೋರ್ಸ್ ಮಾಡಬಹುದು, ಇದನ್ನೇಕೆ ಬರೆಯಬೇಕು?

Mr. SPEAKER.—We will come to that point later.

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY (Chitaldrug).—I agree with the Home Minister that it is a Central subject. But all the same, we should ventilate the difficulties and inconveniences caused to the public on account of the action taken by the Central Government. Instead of Government themselves making a representation on behalf of the people of the State, it would be better if their hands are strengthened by way of a discussion on the basis of some special resolution. I have therefore no objection to withdraw this adjournment motion provided you allow a special resolution to be moved, *i. e.*, if it is taken as a special resolution.

Sri V. M. MASCARENHAS (St. John's Hill).—I do not know why members of the Opposition are making a grievance regarding the curtailment of rights, etc. The Central Government has every right to fix uniform rates for using the telephones to the whole of India. I do not understand why people of Mysore should have a grievance over it, that it is cutting their privilege. If the Central Government fixes a rate for the whole of India, there is no reason why we should make such a hubub over it. Hitherto the privilege we were enjoying has been withdrawn. If that is a grievance, if the Hon'ble Members of the House feel in that manner, a telephone allowance of eight annas or a rupee per day may be given and we will pass it—that every non-residential member should be given a telephone allowance of eight annas or one rupee per day. By discussing this matter here and passing resolutions, why should the Centre think that we are a set of unwise men to pass such resolutions and send them on to the Centre? That is my honest opinion.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟಸ್ವಾಮಿ (ಶ್ರೀರಂಗಪಟ್ಟಣ).—ನನ್ನ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವೂ ಅವರು ಹೇಳಿದ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವಾಗಿದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಹುಚ್ಚೇಗೌಡ (ತುರುವೇಕೆರೆ).—ಇದರಿಂದ ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕರಿಗೆ ತೊಂದರೆಯಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಪೊನ್ನೆ ತಾನೆ ಟೆಲಿಫೋರ್ಸ್ ರೇಟುಗಳನ್ನು ಜಾಸ್ತಿ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈಗಿನ ಆರ್ಡರಿನ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಇನ್ನೂ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಕೊನೆಯಪಕ್ಷ ತಿಂಗಳಿಗೆ ಮೂವತ್ತು ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆ.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—I rise to a point of order, Sir. The subject that is being discussed is only about the admissibility of the adjournment motion. So the question of allowing it as a special resolution or otherwise would not arise. I feel that the time of the House is being wasted. I would submit that the Speaker would rule out all other discussion and give his ruling on the admissibility of the adjournment motion.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—I want to raise a point of order. When the Hon'ble Member said that the time of this House is being wasted, I want to know whether the Hon'ble Member is correct in using such words as wasting the time of the House. I want this for my own future guidance. Is it parliamentary?

Mr. SPEAKER.—We have got important business to do. Therefore, we shall not spend any more time over this. I want to make a statement on the request of the Hon'ble Member regarding telephones. 'Telephones' is no doubt a Central subject. But the difficulties experienced by the people of the State would be a matter which could be legitimately canvassed in the State Legislature. In the present case, I take it that it is the intention of the Mover to merely bring to the notice of the State Government the difficulties caused and to urge that the State Government may take up this matter with the Centre. I would suggest to the Hon'ble Member Sri Mulka Govinda Reddy that he may table a suitable

(MR. SPEAKER.)

motion for this purpose and withdraw the notice of the adjournment motion.

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.—I agree, Sir.

Free use of Telephones by Members.

*Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—Apart from this, I want to bring another thing to the notice of the House. I want to know whether the mofussil members who have been provided with free lodging and board would not be entitled to free use of telephones. Secondly, the list in respect of telephone calls maintained there is rather curious. We have to write our name and to whom we have made that call. We have to make these entries every time as if we are all criminals. Why should they insist on writing the name of the person to whom we phone? We might have phoned to a person whose name we want to keep secret. Firstly, I would like to say that all fees may be waived during the Assembly Session. But if the Government insist on payment, they should not insist that we should write the names. Let them maintain a clerk; let him be on the look out and let him maintain the particulars of the persons who use the telephone. Now the peon comes there and asks for two annas or asks us to write the names. It is a humiliating position. All these things will have to be considered. The best thing would be that the members may be given free telephone service during the course of the session as they are given free quarter and free furniture and free stationery. This is a small matter which the Government must concede.

Mr. SPEAKER.—What does the Treasury Bench say?

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—That will be examined. I quite see the point raised regarding the columns suggested in the book we have maintained there. I see no reason why those columns should be maintained there at all. Suitable alterations will be made.

BUDGET FOR 1955-56—DEMANDS FOR GRANTS—CUT MOTIONS.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM (Jagalur).—Regarding cut motions, I have got something to say at present. Yesterday, there was discussion as to the procedure to be adopted for the discussion of the Demands. I suggested yesterday that all cut motions need not be moved, but they may be referred to the concerned authorities and we may select one important Demand and have full-dressed debate on that. Though it was sympathetically received in many quarters, my friends on the Treasury Bench did not want to adopt this procedure. It is our experience practically for the last six days, to use Sri Puttaswamy's word, that we have wasted our time. We are here to discuss the policy of Government on each Demand and not to ventilate our local grievances. Further, the procedure is so curious that nearly 200 cut motions are tabled and one member gets hardly one minute to speak and the Government take away the remaining time. Moreover no cut motion is discussed in particular and votes taken either for or against it. Sir, it is not at all a debate and it has become a farce. I even now therefore suggest to the members of the Treasury Bench to accept the procedure that I have suggested. What I feel is that the members of the Treasury Bench, according to convention, have no right to table cut motions because their business is to play the songs of the Government and to support them. The object of the cut motion is to censure the Government and it is not at all the privilege of the members of the Treasury Bench to send cut motions. On the other hand, they table cut motions and they are so insistent that it leads to the inevitable conclusion that they want to deprive the Opposition of their right of criticism and, secondly, through these cut motions they want to shield the Government from further criticism and thirdly they are denying an opportunity to this House wherein important matters of policy and important matters pertaining to the future set up could be discussed. We are thereby wasting away our time. Even now, I suggest that in the next six days we